



UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE

UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE
United States Patent and Trademark Office
Address: COMMISSIONER FOR PATENTS
P.O. Box 1450
Alexandria, Virginia 22313-1450
www.uspto.gov

APPLICATION NO.	FILING DATE	FIRST NAMED INVENTOR	ATTORNEY DOCKET NO.	CONFIRMATION NO.
09/895,751	06/28/2001	Arvind Prabhakar	P5935	1048
7590	08/30/2006		EXAMINER	
Wagner Murabito & Hao LLP Two North Market Street Third /Floor San Jose, CA 95113				SHORTLEDGE, THOMAS E
			ART UNIT	PAPER NUMBER
			2626	

DATE MAILED: 08/30/2006

Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.

Office Action Summary	Application No.	Applicant(s)
	09/895,751	PRABHAKAR ET AL.
	Examiner	Art Unit
	Thomas E. Shortledge	2626

-- The MAILING DATE of this communication appears on the cover sheet with the correspondence address --

Period for Reply

A SHORTENED STATUTORY PERIOD FOR REPLY IS SET TO EXPIRE 3 MONTH(S) OR THIRTY (30) DAYS, WHICHEVER IS LONGER, FROM THE MAILING DATE OF THIS COMMUNICATION.

- Extensions of time may be available under the provisions of 37 CFR 1.136(a). In no event, however, may a reply be timely filed after SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- If NO period for reply is specified above, the maximum statutory period will apply and will expire SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- Failure to reply within the set or extended period for reply will, by statute, cause the application to become ABANDONED (35 U.S.C. § 133). Any reply received by the Office later than three months after the mailing date of this communication, even if timely filed, may reduce any earned patent term adjustment. See 37 CFR 1.704(b).

Status

1) Responsive to communication(s) filed on 02 June 2006.

2a) This action is **FINAL**. 2b) This action is non-final.

3) Since this application is in condition for allowance except for formal matters, prosecution as to the merits is closed in accordance with the practice under *Ex parte Quayle*, 1935 C.D. 11, 453 O.G. 213.

Disposition of Claims

4) Claim(s) 1-6, 8-15, 17-24, 26-28, 30-35, 37-42 and 44-48 is/are pending in the application.

4a) Of the above claim(s) _____ is/are withdrawn from consideration.

5) Claim(s) _____ is/are allowed.

6) Claim(s) 1-6, 8-15, 17-24, 26-28, 30-35, 37-42 and 44-48 is/are rejected.

7) Claim(s) _____ is/are objected to.

8) Claim(s) _____ are subject to restriction and/or election requirement.

Application Papers

9) The specification is objected to by the Examiner.

10) The drawing(s) filed on _____ is/are: a) accepted or b) objected to by the Examiner.
Applicant may not request that any objection to the drawing(s) be held in abeyance. See 37 CFR 1.85(a).
Replacement drawing sheet(s) including the correction is required if the drawing(s) is objected to. See 37 CFR 1.121(d).

11) The oath or declaration is objected to by the Examiner. Note the attached Office Action or form PTO-152.

Priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119

12) Acknowledgment is made of a claim for foreign priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119(a)-(d) or (f).

a) All b) Some * c) None of:

- Certified copies of the priority documents have been received.
- Certified copies of the priority documents have been received in Application No. _____.
- Copies of the certified copies of the priority documents have been received in this National Stage application from the International Bureau (PCT Rule 17.2(a)).

* See the attached detailed Office action for a list of the certified copies not received.

Attachment(s)

1) Notice of References Cited (PTO-892)

2) Notice of Draftsperson's Patent Drawing Review (PTO-948)

3) Information Disclosure Statement(s) (PTO-1449 or PTO/SB/08)
Paper No(s)/Mail Date _____.

4) Interview Summary (PTO-413)
Paper No(s)/Mail Date. _____.

5) Notice of Informal Patent Application (PTO-152)

6) Other: _____.

DETAILED ACTION

1. This communication is in response to Remarks, filed 06/02/2006.
2. Claims 1-6, 8-15, 17-24, 26-28, 30-35, 37-42 and 44-48 are pending. Claims 1, 10, 19, 28, 35 and 42 are independent. Claims 7, 16, 25, 29, 36 and 43 have been cancelled. Claims 1, 5, 10-15, 17-19, 23, 35 and 37-41 have been amended.

Continued Examination Under 37 CFR 1.114

3. A request for continued examination under 37 CFR 1.114, including the fee set forth in 37 CFR 1.17(e), was filed in this application after final rejection. Since this application is eligible for continued examination under 37 CFR 1.114, and the fee set forth in 37 CFR 1.17(e) has been timely paid, the finality of the previous Office action has been withdrawn pursuant to 37 CFR 1.114. Applicant's submission filed on 06/02/2006 has been entered.

Response to Arguments

4. Applicant's arguments with respect to claims 1-6, 8-15, 17-24, 26-28, 30-35, 37-42 and 44-48 have been considered but are moot in view of the new ground(s) of rejection.

Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 103

5. The following is a quotation of 35 U.S.C. 103(a) which forms the basis for all obviousness rejections set forth in this Office action:

(a) A patent may not be obtained though the invention is not identically disclosed or described as set forth in section 102 of this title, if the differences between the subject matter sought to be patented and the prior art are such that the subject matter as a whole would have been obvious at the time the invention was made to a person having ordinary skill in the art to which said subject matter pertains. Patentability shall not be negated by the manner in which the invention was made.

Claim 1-6, 8-15, 17-24, 26-28, 30-35, 37-42 and 44-48 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Lakritz (US 6,623,529 B1) in view of Hamann (6,092,036).

As to claims 1 and 10, Lakritz teaches:

a markup language document (HTML content, col. 7, line 19);
identifying one or more localizable string within said at least one token (col. 7, lines 27-29)

creating a file including a translation of said one or more localizable strings (separating country or regional content from the structure of the document into a separate file, where that file can be updated, col. 7, lines 12-18);

creating a second file including non-localized data from said document (separating out the country or regional content into a separate file, leaving the other content in a separate file, col. 7, lines 12-18); and

merging said first file and said second file (finding the correct localization file, and putting the files back together, col. 7, lines 18-20).

Lakritz does not explicitly teach receiving from input from a user specifying a translation of at least one of said one or more localizable strings.

However, Hamann teaches the user is able to input a string in a source language and a string of text translated into the target language (col. 6, lines 48-61).

Therefore, it would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill at the time of invention to combine the methods of Lakritz with the ability to add a translation as taught by Hamann to increase the efficiency of the system by allowing a user to modify and/or a translation to a target text, as taught by Hamann (col. 7, lines 1-10).

As to claim 19, Lakritz teaches:

a processor (a computer, col. 3, lines 25, which would necessarily include a processor);

a memory storing program instructions (a computer with applications, col. 3, lines 25, which would necessarily include a memory);

identifying one or more localizable string within said at least one token (col. 7, lines 27-29)

creating a file including a translation of at least one said localizable string (separating country or regional content from the structure of the document into a separate file, where that file can be updated, col. 7, lines 12-18);

creating a second file including non-localized data from said document (separating out the country or regional content into a separate file, leaving the other content in a separate file, col. 7, lines 12-18); and

merging said first file and said second file (finding the correct localization file, and putting the files back together, col. 7, lines 18-20).

Lakritz does not explicitly teach the program instructions are further executable to receive from input from a user specifying a translation of at least one of said one or more localizable strings.

However, Hamann teaches the user is able to input a string in a source language and a string of text translated into the target language (col. 6, lines 48-61).

Therefore, it would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill at the time of invention to combine the methods of Lakritz with the ability to add a translation as taught by Hamann to increase the efficiency of the system by allowing a user to modify and/or a translation to a target text, as taught by Hamann (col. 7, lines 1-10).

As to claims 28, and 35, Lakritz teaches:

identify at least one token within said document (col. 7, lines 27-29);

identify one or more localizable string within said at least one token (col. 7, lines 27-29);

prompting a user for confirmation of said identifying said one ore more localizable string (creating user-defined term databases, where the user is prompted to supply a

translation for each language to be used, col. 28, lines 24-34 and 63-67 and col. 29, lines 1-30);

extract said one or more localizable string from said document (separating country or regional content from the structure of the document into a separate file, where that file can be updated, col. 7, lines 12-18);

translate at least one of said one or more extracted localizable string (supplying a translation, col. 7, lines 36-40);

extracting non-localizable string from said document (separating out the country or regional content into a separate file, leaving the other content in a separate file, col. 7, lines 12-18); and

merging said extracted non-localizable data with at least one of said translated one or more localizable string and said extracted one or more localizable string (finding the correct localization file, and putting the files back together, col. 7, lines 18-20).

Lakritz does not explicitly teach said translating comprises receiving input from a user specifying a translation of at least one of said one or more localizable strings.

However, Hamann teaches the user is able to input a string in a source language and a string of text translated into the target language (col. 6, lines 48-61).

Therefore, it would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill at the time of invention to combine the methods of Lakritz with the ability to add a translation as taught by Hamann to increase the efficiency of the system by allowing a user to modify and/or a translation to a target text, as taught by Hamann (col. 7, lines 1-10).

As to claim 42, Lakritz teaches:

a processor (a computer, col. 3, lines 25, which would necessarily include a processor);

a memory storing program instructions (a computer with applications, col. 3, lines 25, which would necessarily include a memory);

identify at least one token within said document (col. 7, lines 27-29);

identify one or more localizable string within said at least one token (col. 7, lines 27-29);

prompt a user for confirmation of said identifying said one or more localizable strings (creating user-defined term databases, where the user is prompted to supply a translation for each language to be used, col. 28, lines 24-34 and 63-67 and col. 29, lines 1-30);

extract said one or more localizable strings from said document (separating country or regional content from the structure of the document into a separate file, where that file can be updated, col. 7, lines 12-18);

translate at least one said extracted localizable string (supplying a translation, col. 7, lines 36-40);

extracting non-localizable string from said document (separating out the country or regional content into a separate file, leaving the other content in a separate file, col. 7, lines 12-18); and

merging said extracted non-localizable data with at least one of said translated one or more localizable string and said extracted one or more localizable string (finding the correct localization file, and putting the files back together, col. 7, lines 18-20).

Lakritz does not explicitly teach translating at least one of said extracted one or more localizable strings, the program instructions are executable to receive input from a user specifying a translation of at least one of said one or more localizable strings.

However, Hamann teaches the user is able to input a string in a source language and a string of text translated into the target language (col. 6, lines 48-61).

Therefore, it would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill at the time of invention to combine the methods of Lakritz with the ability to add a translation as taught by Hamann to increase the efficiency of the system by allowing a user to modify and/or a translation to a target text, as taught by Hamann (col. 7, lines 1-10).

As to claims 2, 11, and 20, Lakritz teaches prompting a user for confirmation of said identifying said one or more localizable strings (users are allowed to edit the information, col. 8, lines 53-56, further creating user-defined term databases, where the user is prompted to supply a translation for each language to be used, col. 28, lines 24-34 and 63-67 and col. 29, lines 1-30).

As to claims 3, 12 and 21, Lakritz teaches creating a third file including said one or more localizable strings (creating a separate file for each of the country or regions for

the content to be translated into (col. 7, lines 12-18), which would necessary include creating a third or more file).

As to claims 4, 13 and 22, Lakritz teaches merging includes merging said third file (merging the files based on the needed translation (col. 7, lines 12-18, and 27-40), where it would be necessary that if the information from the third file was needed, that information would be merged).

As to claims 5, 14, 23, 30, 37 and 44, Lakritz does not explicitly teach editing said first file to modify said user-supplied translation.

However, Hamann teaches the user is able to input or edit a string in a source language and a string of text translated into the target language (col. 6, lines 48-61).

Therefore, it would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill at the time of invention to combine the methods of Lakritz with the ability to add a translation as taught by Hamann to increase the efficiency of the system by allowing a user to modify and/or a translation to a target text, as taught by Hamann (col. 7, lines 1-10).

As to claims 6, 15, 24, 31, 38, and 45, Lakritz teaches merging further includes recording said user-supplied translation within said first file into a dictionary module (saving the visitors translations for a later use, col. 8, lines 53-60).

As to claims 8, 17, 26, 33, 40 and 47, Lakritz teaches screening a string of characters with said document whether said string of characters is at least one of bounded and unbounded (finding a string to be translated that is bounded by the tags, col. 7, line 35).

As to claims 9, 18, 27, 34, 41 and 48, Lakritz teaches said one or more localizable string includes at least one of data and executable code (a string in text, col. 7, lines 35-36).

As to claims 32, 39, and 46, Lakritz teaches one of a dictionary translation (using a dictionary translation col. 7, lines 45, and col. 8, lines 53-56).

Conclusion

Any inquiry concerning this communication or earlier communications from the examiner should be directed to Thomas E. Shortledge whose telephone number is (571)272-7612. The examiner can normally be reached on M-F 8:00 - 4:30.

If attempts to reach the examiner by telephone are unsuccessful, the examiner's supervisor, Richemond Dorvil can be reached on (571)272-7602. The fax phone number for the organization where this application or proceeding is assigned is 571-273-8300.

Information regarding the status of an application may be obtained from the Patent Application Information Retrieval (PAIR) system. Status information for published applications may be obtained from either Private PAIR or Public PAIR. Status information for unpublished applications is available through Private PAIR only. For more information about the PAIR system, see <http://pair-direct.uspto.gov>. Should you have questions on access to the Private PAIR system, contact the Electronic Business Center (EBC) at 866-217-9197 (toll-free). If you would like assistance from a USPTO Customer Service Representative or access to the automated information system, call 800-786-9199 (IN USA OR CANADA) or 571-272-1000.

TS
08/25/06



RICHEMOND DORVIL
SUPERVISORY PATENT EXAMINER